

Remarks/Arguments

This is a full and timely response to the Office action mailed January 26, 2005. Upon entry of the amendments in this response, claims 1-4, 9-10 and 12-22 remain pending. In particular, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 9-10 and 12-22 and have canceled claims 4-8, 11, 23-24 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicants have canceled claims merely to reduce the number of disputed issues and to facilitate early allowance and issuance of other claims in the present application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of these canceled claims in a continuing application, if Applicants so choose, and do not intend to dedicate the canceled subject matter to the public. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action indicates that claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fitzsimons et al., US Patent Publication 2003/0034991, hereinafter *Fitzsimons*. With respect to the pending claims, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In this regard, amended claim 1 (emphasis added) recites:

1. A method, comprising:

- (a) providing a web client computer connected to a network, where the client includes an application programmatic interface (API);
- (b) receiving, at the client, web content from a first remote web server connected to the network, where the web content enables the client, in response to user input, to select images and to create a composite image from the selected images;
- (c) issuing, by the web content, a device independent call to the API; and
- (d) responding to the call;

wherein steps (b), (c) and (d) are performed while a user is logged into the client;

wherein the responding step is performed by adding the composite image to the user's personal collection of job images.

Applicants respectfully assert that *Fitzsimons* is legally deficient for the purpose of anticipating claim 1, because *Fitzsimons* does not teach or otherwise disclose at least the features/limitations emphasized above in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is improper and requests that claim 1 be placed in condition for allowance.

More particularly, nowhere does *Fitzsimons* discuss an API or a call to an API. *Fitzsimons*, therefore, cannot teach the claim 1 Web content (downloaded from a remote web server) that issues a device independent call to an API of a client computer. Furthermore, nowhere does *Fitzsimons* teach the claim 1 step of responding to the device independent call by adding the composite image to a user's personal collection of job images.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

With regard to amended independent claims 9, 15 and 18 it is respectfully submitted that these claims recite similar features as claim 1 and therefore these claims are not anticipated by *Fitzsimons*.

Further, since the dependent claims incorporate all the feature/limitations of their respective independent claims, Applicants respectfully assert that these claims are also in condition for allowance. Additionally, these claims recite other features/limitations that can serve as an independent basis for patentability.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Applicants' pending claims are in condition for allowance. No new matter has been added.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (208) 396-5263.

Respectfully submitted,
Shell S. Simpson

Date

5/25/05

By

Matthew L. Wade
Matthew L. Wade
Reg. No. 42,206

Case: 10007663-1
S/N: 10/080788

9